

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/836,135	04/16/2001	Yasushi Hosono	MM4424	5811
1109 7.	590 10/15/2004	EXAMINER		INER
ANDERSON, KILL & OLICK, P.C.			HINDI, NABIL Z	
1251 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK,, NY 10020-1182			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
TIEW TOTAL,,	111 10020 1102		2655	
	,	•	DATE MAILED: 10/15/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary	09/836,135	HOSONO, YASUSHI				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
The MAN INC DATE of the	NABIL Z HINDI	2655				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 May 2004.						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2,3,5 and 6</u> is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 4</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
S. Patent and Trademark Office						

Application/Control Number: 09/836,135

Art Unit: 2655

In response to applicant's amendment dated May 21, 2004, the following action is taken:

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kajiyama et al (6108296) in view of Ogino et al (6430291)

The reference shows an optical disk recoding and reproducing apparatus wherein a copyright management data is recorded in the lead-I or lead-out area of the disk, determining if the copyright data is written (illegal disk or not) and if not controlling the rotational speed of the disk by ejecting (stopping) the rotation as shown in figs 3 and 4. However the reference ids not drawn to a DVD disk. The secondary reference discloses the use f copyright protection on a DVD disk in an optical disk apparatus as shown in column 4 lines 55-60. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of the secondary reference and modify the primary reference. Such modification of using a DVD as a medium is merely a medium equivalence to any other optical disk mediums such as a CD. Thus it would have been obvious use a DVD medium as opposed to a CD for the purpose of increasing the data capacity on a disk.

Art Unit: 2655

Claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 are allowed.

None of the cited prior art shows or teaches whether "computer data" is recoded into a DVD optical disk or not and controlling the disk rotational speed accordingly as claimed.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 4 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to NABIL Z HINDI at telephone number (703) 308-1555.

PRIMARY EXAMINER

22,5

Page 3